

ITEM 12
BILL 69 (2013)

From: DRJLAM@aol.com

Sent: Tuesday, January 14, 2014 3:22 PM

To: Kobayashi, Ann; Fukunaga, Carol A; schang@honolulu.gov; kpine@honolulu.gov; Martin, Ernie; Menor, Ron; Manahan, Joey; , mail@outdoorcircle.org

Subject: Testimony on Bill 69

RECEIVED
CITY CLERK
C & C OF HONOLULU
2014 JAN 14 PM 4:15

Subject: Bill 69 hearing on Friday, January 17, 2014 at 9 am at Honolulu Hale Committee hearing Room

Councilwoman Ann Kobayashi
Chairperson, Budget Committee
City Council of Honolulu
Honolulu, HI 96813

Councilwoman Kobayashi and the Budget Committee,
I am submitting testimony in opposition to Bill 69.

The administration has revisited the topic of outdoor bus advertising after introducing the idea in 2003. They want to change the present law that bans all outdoor, off-site advertising.

That is why we presently have no billboards, no aerial advertising and no mobile advertising (Section 445-111 to 445-121, 1990). Laws limiting outdoor advertising are designed to protect Hawaii's most valuable asset, her aesthetic and fragile environment.

The new law will open the floodgates for controversy and expensive 1st amendment lawsuits. Someone in the City, perhaps in the Corporation Counsels Office or Ethics Office, will have to play judge and jury to all kinds of new and provocative ads. They will never be able to gauge the public outcry to bus billboards promoting marijuana being safe than alcohol, women's swimwear or McDonald's allegations of nutrition.

It will set an obvious precedent for outdoor advertising in Hawaii. If buses can bring in X dollars, taxi and handivan advertising can bring in additional funds. HART recently announced plans for artistic Hawaiian decor on the cement pillars along the rail route. The rail cars may also be next step in outdoor ads. No one is in political office forever and can guarantee where it will stop. In the past, aerial advertising banners that were going to show dead fetuses in the abortion debate was thankfully banned.

The amount of money the City will realize from this folly which may be \$2 to \$8 million is miniscule compared with the Bus budget of \$210 million. The monetary gain for the risk of destroying the scenic beauty of Hawaii forever is not worth it. Who is here to protect the aina? The billboards on buses certainly will not attract more tourists and may keep eco-tourism growth at bay. The City has only to sell one condemned beachfront property at Niu waterfront to bring themselves \$2 million. Many other properties sit idle waiting for what?

There are many other ways for the City to generate funds without sacrificing the future beauty of our State. They should do it with options that do not change the laws that keep Hawaii clean and green. I wonder if Bill 69 will override the current HRS Sections 445-111 to 445-121 which bans outdoor advertising. A court case will be sure to follow this bill.

I think the Budget Committee should sense what is right for Hawaii and what will be trouble ahead and hold the bill here in committee. Thank you considering my testimony against Bill 69.

Sincerely,

Jeremy Lam
2230 Kamehameha Avenue
Honolulu HI 96822
drjlam@aol.com

PETITION 1

Petition - signatures 3

1/14/2014

B

ITEM 12
BILL 69 (2013)

From: manoamac@aol.com
Sent: Monday, January 13, 2014 11:10 PM
To: Kobayashi, Ann; Fukunaga, Carol A; schang@honolulu.gov; kkpine@honolulu.gov; Menor, Ron; Manahan, Joey; ; maki@outdoorcircle.org
Subject: Fwd: Testimony for Bill 69

RECEIVED
CITY CLERK
C & C OF HONOLULU
2014 JAN 14 AM 8:17

-----Original Message-----

From: DRJLAM <DRJLAM@aol.com>
 Sent: Mon, Jan 13, 2014 10:31 pm
 Subject: Testimony for Bill 69

akobayashi@honolulu.gov, cafukunaga@honolulu.gov, schang@honolulu.gov, kpine@honolulu.gov,
emartin@honolulu.gov, rmenor@honolulu.gov, jmanahan@honolulu.gov,
mail@outdoorcircle.org

Subject: Bill 69 hearing on Friday, January 17, 2014 at 9 am at Honolulu Hale Committee hearing Room

Councilwoman Ann Kobayashi
 Chairperson, Budget Committee
 City Council of Honolulu
 Honolulu, HI 96813
 Councilwoman Kobayashi and the Budget Committee,

I am submitting testimony in opposition to Bill 69.

The administration has revisited the topic of outdoor bus advertising after introducing the idea in 2003. They want to change the present law that bans all outdoor, off-site advertising. That is why we presently have no billboards, no aerial advertising and no mobile advertising (Section 445-111 to 445-121, 1990). Laws limiting outdoor advertising are designed to protect Hawaii's most valuable asset, her aesthetic and fragile environment.

The new law will open the floodgates for controversy and expensive 1st amendment lawsuits. Someone in the City, perhaps in the Corporation Counsels Office or Ethics Office, will have to play judge and jury to all kinds of new and provocative ads. They will never be able to gauge the public outcry to bus billboards promoting marijuana being safe than alcohol, women's swimwear or McDonald's allegations of nutrition.

It will set an obvious precedent for outdoor advertising in Hawaii. If buses can bring in X dollars, taxi and handivan advertising can bring in additional funds. HART recently announced plans for artistic Hawaiian decor on the cement pillars along the rail route. The rail cars may also be next step in outdoor ads. No one is in political office forever and can guarantee where it will stop. In the past, aerial advertising banners that were going to show dead fetuses in the

abortion debate was thankfully banned.

The amount of money the City will realize from this folly which may be \$2 to \$8 million is miniscule compared with the Bus budget of \$210 million. The monetary gain for the risk of destroying the scenic beauty of Hawaii forever is not worth it. Who is here to protect the aina? The billboards on buses certainly will not attract more tourists and may keep eco-tourism growth at bay. The City has only to sell one condemned beachfront property at Niu waterfront to bring themselves \$2 million. Many other properties sit idle waiting for what?

There are many other ways for the City to generate funds without sacrificing the future beauty of our State. They should do it with options that do not change the laws that keep Hawaii clean and green. I wonder if Bill 69 will override the current HRS Sections 445-111 to 445-121 which bans outdoor advertising. A court case will be sure to follow this bill.

I think the Budget Committee should sense what is right for Hawaii and what will be trouble ahead and hold the bill here in committee. Thank you considering my testimony against Bill 69.

Sincerely,
Chris and Beth McLachlin
2026 Hunnewell st
Honolulu HI 96822
manoamac@aol.com

1/14/2014

ITEM 12
BILL 69 (2013)

From: kailualynn@aol.com
Sent: Tuesday, January 14, 2014 2:34 PM
To: Kobayashi, Ann; Fukunaga, Carol A; schang@honolulu.gov; kpine@honolulu.gov; Martin, Ernie; Menor, Ron; Manahan, Joey; mail@outdoorcircle.org
Subject: Oppose Bill 69

I am submitting testimony in opposition to Bill 69.

The administration has revisited the topic of outdoor bus advertising after introducing the idea in 2003. They want to change the present law that bans all outdoor, off-site advertising.

That is why we presently have no billboards, no aerial advertising and no mobile advertising (Section 445-111 to 445-121, 1990). Laws limiting outdoor advertising are designed to protect Hawaii's most valuable asset, her aesthetic and fragile environment.

The new law will open the floodgates for controversy and expensive 1st amendment lawsuits. Someone in the City, perhaps in the Corporation Counsels Office or Ethics Office, will have to play judge and jury to all kinds of new and provocative ads. They will never be able to gauge the public outcry to bus billboards promoting marijuana being safe than alcohol, women's swimwear or McDonald's allegations of nutrition.

It will set an obvious precedent for outdoor advertising in Hawaii. If buses can bring in X dollars, taxi and handivan advertising can bring in additional funds. HART recently announced plans for artistic Hawaiian decor on the cement pillars along the rail route. The rail cars may also be next step in outdoor ads. No one is in political office forever and can guarantee where it will stop. In the past, aerial advertising banners that were going to show dead fetuses in the abortion debate was thankfully banned.

The amount of money the City will realize from this folly which may be \$2 to \$8 million is miniscule compared with the Bus budget of \$210 million. The monetary gain for the risk of destroying the scenic beauty of Hawaii forever is not worth it. Who is here to protect the aina? The billboards on buses certainly will not attract more tourists and may keep eco-tourism growth at bay. The City has only to sell one condemned beachfront property at Niu waterfront to bring themselves \$2 million. Many other properties sit idle waiting for what?

There are many other ways for the City to generate funds without sacrificing the future beauty of our State. They should do it with options that do not change the laws that keep Hawaii clean and green. I wonder if Bill 69 will override the current HRS Sections 445-111 to 445-121 which bans outdoor advertising. A court case will be sure to follow this bill.

I think the Budget Committee should sense what is right for Hawaii and what will be trouble ahead and hold the bill here in committee. Thank you considering my

2014 JAN 14 PM 3:01
RECEIVED
CITY CLERK
C & C OF HONOLULU

testimony against Bill 69.

Sincerely,

Lynn Rogers
(Kailua resident)

1/14/2014